DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 385 CG 007 815

TITLE	Delinquency Prevention Through Youth Development.
INSTITUTION	Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	DHEW-SRS-73-26013
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	35p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Programs; Delinquency; *Delinquency Causes; *Delinquency Prevention; Delinquent Behavior; Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Delinquents; *Institutional Role; Publications; Social Change; Socially Deviant Behavior; *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

This publication discusses an emerging strategy for preventing delinquency and helping the youth of the United States. It is based on a reassessment of present public policies for dealing with youthful deviance, and on the development of new linkages between an understanding of what causes such activities and what can be done about them. The strategy itself focuses on institutional reform, without overlooking the importance of direct work with individuals and families. Provision of services to help prevent delinquency as well as rehabilitation of youth already in trouble with the law are stressed. The study points up the legitimate role which youth have to play and the fact that institutions must change to help provide those roles. The strategy further states that whenever possible troubled youth should be diverted from the juvenile justice system and furnished aid through community-based programs. The publication summarizes principles that are offered as guides in establishing programs of youth development and delinquency prevention. (Author/SES)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 073385

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION THROUGH YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

CG 007 815

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PA YDDPA YDDPA YDDPA YDDP
YDDPA YDDPA YDDPA YDDPA
PA YDDPA YDDPA YDDPA YDDP
YDDPA YDDPA YDDPA YDDPA

ED 073385

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION THROUGH YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Social and Rehabilitation Service

Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration
DHEW Publication No. (SRS) 73–26013

FOREWORD

At the very beginning, this publication states: "Clearly, a fresh look at the problem (of delinquency) is warranted. This needs to be based on a reassessment of present public policies for dealing with youthful deviance, and on the development of new linkages between an understanding of what causes such activities and what can and should be done about them. . . ."

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION THROUGH YOUTH DEVELOPMENT is just that, a "fresh look" at a persistent problem that plagues us sorely, and worsens each year. This publication is a cogent presentation of an emerging strategy for preventing delinquency and helping the nation's youth.

The strategy itself focusses on institutional reform, without overlooking the importance of direct work with individuals and families. The strategy stresses providing services to help prevent delinquency, as well as to rehabilitate youth already in trouble with the law. The strategy says that youth have legitimate roles to play, and institutions must change to help provide those roles. And the strategy states that whenever possible troubled youth should be diverted from the juvenile justice system, and furnished needed aid through community-based programs.

The publication summarizes principles that are offered as guides in establishing programs of youth development and delinquency prevention. It is *not* a "how-to-do-it" manual for preventing delinquency. It *is* a statement of a national strategy that can be a viable mechanism for furnishing all our youth with the help they need and deserve.

The publication is based on the best current thinking by some of the country's leading educators, sociologists, youth workers, and others professionally concerned with the well-being of youth. It was prepared over many months by these dedicated men and women, and represents a formalized exposition of their thoughts and ideas. The writing was accomplished by Kenneth Polk of the University of Oregon, and Solomon Kobrin of the University of Southern California.

ROBERT J. GEMIGNANI
Commissioner, Youth Development and
Delinquency Prevention Administration

CONTENTS

	Foreword	i
I.	Introduction	1
II.	The case for an institutional approach	4
III.	The adolescent and promises of adulthood	11
IV.	Some principles for creation of youth development and delinquency prevention programs	19
V.	Summary	28
	Footnotes	31

I. INTRODUCTION

Evils do not disappear because people disapprove of them, unless conditions at their root are changed.[1]

Programs for the effective prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth crime continue to elude decision-makers at the national, State, and local levels. Despite rapidly expanding prevention efforts during recent years, illegal behavior by young people has grown more extensive since the post World War II period. During the past decade, especially, the problem has been further compounded by the emergence of new patterns of group dissidence on the part of many young people who were formerly free of highly visible forms of illegal activity.

Moreover, among some youths today, both relatively rich and poor alike, dissidence in far too many instances has been replaced by collective withdrawal and sometimes calculated violence. While today as yesterday, a large number of young violators continue to be involved in petty theft, truancy, and, in some instances, vandalism, there has now been added to these familiar forms of delinquency such violations as massive drug abuse, planned violence against established institutions, and offenses against property and persons.

Currently it is a fact that our corrective efforts are insufficient for significantly preventing or controlling youthful deviance. The increased rates speak for themselves as an indication of our inability to prevent. The high rates of recidivism, unfortunately true even of many sophisticated treatment efforts, speak to the failure of our control procedures.[2]

Clearly, a fresh look at the problem is warranted. This needs to be based on a reassessment of present public policies for dealing with youthful deviance, and on the development of new linkages between an understanding of what causes such activities and what can and should be done about them in policy terms at the Federal, State, and local levels. Unfortunately, much of what is known is not presently being used in direct intervention strategies. Much of what needs to be learned is not even being addressed in a systematic and comprehensive manner.

The Scituate Statement

A group invited by the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare met in Scituate, Massachusetts in June, 1970, to consider the problems of youth development and delinquency prevention. There the kernel of an idea was advanced which might provide some new directions for guiding youth development programs. In the short document produced at that meeting it was stated:

> We believe that our social institutions are programmed in such a way as to deny large numbers of young people socially acceptable, responsible, and personally gratifying roles. These institutions should seek ways of becoming more responsive to youth needs.

It went on to state that any strategy for youth development and delinquency prevention should give priority to:

> . . . programs which assist institutions to change in ways that provide young people with socially acceptable, responsible, personally gratifying roles and assist young people to assume such roles.

It is necessary to face immediately both what this statement says, and just as importantly, what is left unsaid. What is stated is an assumption, and no more than that, that the important element in any strategy is *insitutional,* rather than individual, change. The premise is that effective youth development programs must *start* with a consideration of the institutional forces which impinge on youth and shape their behavior. This was made more explicit in the "National Strategy" document which evolved after the meeting at Scituate:

> These propositions furnish a basic perspective on the problem of delinquency by linking it firmly to specific types of failure on the part of specific social institutions as they seek to relate to young people, and, in turn, to the negative reactions of young people to such institutions when they find them wanting. It follows from this that the development of a viable national strategy for the prevention and reduction of delinquency rests on the identification, assessment, and alteration of those features of institutional functioning that impede and obstruct a favorable course of youth development for all youths, particularly those whose social situation makes them most prone to the development of delinquent careers and to participation in collective forms of withdrawal and deviancy.[3]

Such statements at this level *do not* identify which specific institutions are to be changed, nor in what ways. Furthermore, they do not make a case for such an approach. What has to be established are how some features of institutional functioning create, maintain, or aggravate youthful misconduct, and then in concrete terms how institutional practices can be altered.

In presenting a case for a strategy focused on institutional reform it should be acknowledged that the idea is not without precedent. Indeed, a major tradition in the history of delinquency prevention efforts in the United States is the dedication to the goals of primary prevention, goals logically including institutional change. Such efforts have sought to remedy deficiencies in virtually every one of the significant socializing and control agencies of society—most notably the family, but the school and the neighborhood as well. Included in this approach has been also the provision of services, such as recreation and "character building," whose absence was at one time widely assumed to be a cause of de-

linquency. Their general failure to produce the remedy sought has been attributed to the limited allocation of money and trained manpower. There is no possibility of either refuting or affirming such propositions; but it may be observed that most such programs failed to address the basic design and operating assumptions of the institutions involved. The prevailing if unspoken view was that in their essential character they were well adapted to their functions, and that the task was merely to remove obstacles to their more rational and efficient operation. The question of the source of such obstacles, of the sense in which they were intrinsic to their very design, seems not to have arisen.

Advances in knowledge and experience [4] during recent years have reaffirmed the earlier wisdom of attending to problems of institutional design and practice. They have also helped to disclose in a concrete way elements of structure and process which account for the failure of institutions to perform their manifest functions.

This institutional focus does not overlook the importance of direct work with individuals and families. Attention must be given to services directed at the prevention of individual delinquency, as well as to the rehabilitation of youths already involved with law enforcement or correctional agencies. The institutional focus emphasized in this strategy identifies those features of the social environment whose interaction with human personality produces malignant behavioral effects, then proceeds to approach the individual, through and by means of an alteration of some institutional process.

Thus, the approach taken here does not deny the occurrence of individual pathology, or that such states are sometimes directly implicated in delinquent behavior. But it does assert the commonly accepted dictum that in most such cases the pathology is traceable in turn to the damaging experiences encountered by the young person as a member of the family, or the play group, or the school, or of all three.

II. THE CASE FOR AN INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH

A. COMMITMENT TO CONFORMITY

The most common way to initiate a discussion of delinquency prevention is to search out those factors which are presumed to cause delinquency, then set forth programs which address the causes. We propose to start somewhat differently, asking first what is it that builds a stake in conformity,[6] so that some youth are provided with a socially acceptable concept of self which "insulates" against delinquency.[7] The analysis of conformity will begin with an examination of the character of adult, rather than adolescent life, in order to build a case that *it is the denial of access to the type of institutional experiences that are the sources of conformity in adult life that lies at the root of much adolescent alienation and rebellion.*

B. ADULT CONSTRAINTS: THE INSTITUTIONAL COMPONENTS OF LEGITIMATE IDENTITY

One of the clearest facts known about delinquency, yet one we often overlook, is that *it is characteristically adolescent behavior.* Law violation is virtually non-existent before the onset of the teenage years, rises sharply shortly after the onset of adolescence, hits its highest peak around 16 or 17, and declines rapidly after that point, becoming exceedingly rare in middle or late adulthood.

What is it about adolescence that is so problematic? What is it that precipitates problems at this point? As Friedenberg put it:

> A great many young people are in very serious trouble throughout the technically developed and especially the Western world Their trouble, moreover, follows certain familiar common patterns; they get into much the same kind of difficulty in very different societies. But it is nevertheless strange that they should. Human life is a continuous thread which each of us spins to his own pattern, rich and complex in meaning. There are no natural knots in it. Yet knots form, nearly always in adolescence.[8]

The knots of adolescence, we believe, can be understood most fruitfully when we contrast the adolescent with the adult experience. Our concern here is to identify those features of adult roles which are part of "legitimate" identity, which, when fully developed, provide insulating self-concepts. Out of the organized institutional features of conventional adult community life, there appear to be produced four especially significant components of legitimate identity: [9]

1. A sense of *competence,* especially in (but not limited to) the work

role. For most, work conveys the feeling that there is something not only that they can do, but that they do well.

2. A sense of *usefulness.* Work, family, and other roles do more than occupy time and produce money. They also are the grounds for social definitions of the self. One such is the feeling that the person has something to contribute, that what he does represents something which people value.

3. A sense of *belongingness.* Work, family, political and other roles serve through their *active* commitment to locate a person in a social world, to convey a sense that he "belongs." The work setting, the family scene, create settings and groups wherein the individual knows he has a place, where he knows that he "fits."

4. A sense of *power or potency.* One of the awesome features of contemporary existence is our collective vulnerability to feelings of powerlessness. The problem transcends the limited boundaries of what we traditionally label "political." It has to do with our ability to exercise some control over those persons, organizations, or institutions around us which are, or are attempting, to control us.

While a number of attributes can establish a basis for feelings of power, one obvious factor is social class. Persons with high status position, who live in the "right" parts of town, feel that such agencies as schools or police function in their interest, and they feel, consequently, some control over policy.

But in the present day world, it is necessary to include in this analysis the important ingredient of work. One obvious reason is that for large numbers of persons it is their job which defines their economic position, and thus their power

The way work is organized also has its effects on feelings of power. Seeman argues that there are two control elements in work life that relate to power: the presence of an organization that yields some control over work and occupational setting, and the individual's involvement in such an organization:

> A person's feelings of self-reliance and power are tied up with whether he belongs to an organization that has some control over his occupational destiny. If he does belong to such an organization, union, business, or professional association—his further feelings of mastery are directly tied up with how actively he works in it—whether he has some control over its destiny.[10]

With regard to these four particular features of legitimate identity in adult life, what is central is their *institutional character.* The feelings of competence, meaningfulness, belongingness, and political potency derive from roles in the work world especially, but also in such institutional arenas as politics, the family, recreation, or cultural activities. These are not things which people generate by themselves. They come from the

social world outside, and from particular kinds of institutions in that world.

In large metropolitan settings, the community one lives in also has a direct bearing on his feelings of power. Hard data support what our eyes tell us: when you live in the low income areas, the quality of service provided by schools, public health, and recreation is likely to be lower than found in better areas.[13] The neighborhood, then, exerts an effect of its own in conveying to individuals a conception of the extent to which they can influence their environment. The slum or ghetto dweller, as a result of common practices in agencies like schools, police, or courts, is much more likely to feel that such institutions do not function in his interest.

Institutions, then, are critical in providing the conditions which generate legitimate identity. When trouble occurs in what should be the orderly movement into legitimate life careers, we shall look to problems in the institutional fabric.

Are there problems in the way individuals *gain access* to institutional roles that might account for the emergence of illegal behavior and illegitimate identity? The relevance of such a question in the case of the adolescent should be obvious. Adolescence is assumed to be a transitional state into adulthood. When we find systematic, recurring difficulties in this age period, it is only reasonable to ask if these are a consequence of the failure of institutions to provide access to experiences which would make for a smooth progression. This perspective places the question of individual pathology as a cause of delinquency in the context of the role networks that define the institutions significant in the experience of the adolescent. Institutional arrangements that consign some young people to roles that obstruct normal transition to adulthood, or that reinforce maladaptive forms of behavior, represent virulent forces directly responsible for much individual pathology. *It follows from this view that as a practical and strategic matter the approach to the problem of adolescent deviance, and to delinquency prevention and control, must focus on institutional malfunction.*

If the problem of delinquency (or alienation, rebellion, and unrest) is a product of some individually based pathology, then a form of individually centered clinic service is called for, such as counseling, therapy, treatment, or behavior modification. If, on the other hand, one looks to the nature of institutional experiences as the source of the problem, then he is likely to suggest that specific institutional practices be altered. What such an approach requires, however, is a thorough analysis of institutional contexts, coupled with concrete suggestions for institutional changes which link up with the causal analysis.

In the case of adolescence, it will be argued that much of what we call adolescent problems lies within the particular institutional practices used to socialize the adolescent. In this transitional period between child-

hood and adulthood, a number of institutions function to establish rules, regulations, statuses, and identities. In a society that places high values on credentials, a critical set of institutions for the adolescent is found in the *nexus* between education and work, although other institutions such as police, courts, welfare, and recreation also have roles to play. Given the rapid changes that have occurred in this country in the past few decades, it is easy to comprehend how the combined weight of these institutional arrangements have become like an out-of-focus lens, resulting in the generation of feelings of meaninglessness and powerlessness among vast numbers of young people, and delinquency among a few.

C. YOUTH AND THE INSTITUTIONAL DENIAL OF LEGITIMACY

When we compare youth and adult access to roles through which a legitimate identity may be consolidated, the contrast is striking. Our institutions systematically, if inadvertantly, *deny* young people roles that impart feelings of competence, meaningfulness, belongingness, or political potency.

Starting with the last of these, we find that the young in our society are locked into roles of passivity and powerlessness. This is especially visible in the law and how it operates. Juvenile court philosophy, as one illustration, traditionally has assumed the concept of *parens patriae* whereby the state becomes the ultimate parent and protector of the young. But the young may not hold office, will not be agents of the court, they may not write law. They must instead submit to it.

What is involved, then, is a peculiar imbalance in youth-adult relations. The young are to be held accountable by adults for their behavior, but adults are not to be constrained by adolescents. Friedenberg has astutely sized up this problem, noting in the specific instance of school attendance laws:

> Compulsory school attendance, however, is provided by a law which recognizes no obligation of the school that the students can enforce. He cannot petition to withdraw if the school is inferior, does not maintain standards, or treats him brutally. There are other laws, certainly, that set standards for school construction and maintenance, the licensing of teachers, techniques of discipline, and so forth; and proceedings under these may be invoked if the school does not abide by them. But they do not abate the student's obligation to attend the school and accept its services. His position is purely that of a conscript who is protected by certain regulations but in no case permitted to use their breach as a cause for terminating his obligation.[15]

What is important to grasp is that this power problem is established institutionally and flows outward through bureaucracies. Friedenberg goes on to point out, for illustration, how families have different constraints than bureaucracies. The intimacy and closeness, the complex mix of feelings, needs, or motives make families run by emotional processes

far removed from the regulations, roles, or standard operating procedures that define bureaucratic authority. Organizational authority, especially in the school, holds students in line in many destructive ways:

> A corollary of the school's assumption of custodial control of students is that power and authority become indistinguishable. If the school's authority is not limited to matters pertaining to education, it cannot be derived from educational responsibilities. It is a naked, empirical fact, to be accepted or controverted according to the possibilities of the moment. In this world power counts more than legitimacy; if you don't have power it is naive to think you have rights that must be respected; wise up. High school students experience regulation only as control, not as protection; they know, for example, that the principal will generally uphold the teacher in any conflict with a student, regardless of the merits of the case.[16]

Friedenberg notes that this is not resented by youth, which he finds tragic. But, as his own analysis makes clear, adolescents have precious few options other than passivity.

When we turn to feelings of belongingness, the young suffer under further constraints. For those below the age of 18, the law itself denies active political involvement at local, State, or national level. Child labor laws, work permit regulations, plus the fact that during the customary work hours they are required to be in school, limit their involvement in work institutions.

Most conventional cultural and recreation activities are funneled through the school. The consequence is that the school, and not the wide range of other community agencies or organizations, becomes in many communities the principal and focal point around which any sense of belongingness can develop. It is no wonder that the school becomes a major reference point in establishing who the adolescent is, and where he belongs.

One severely restrictive aspect of this mode of identity formation is that the educational process isolates young persons from the rest of the community. This separation, institutionally imposed, impedes the most simple of adult-youth communication processes. Youth are not permitted to know from experience the real adult world of politics or work, and conversely adults have little feeling for or understanding of the social world of adolescents. It is no wonder, then, that when problems like drug use amerge among the young, adults find themselves powerless to communicate, let alone understand and take constructive action to deal with the problem.

This insulation of the adolescent by means of the school becomes particularly problematic in those community settings where in the eyes of vast numbers of its students the school has come to be viewed as a discredited institution. The high level of alienation found in the ghetto school, *in the absence of other legitimate institutional experiences,* vir-

tually assures that vast numbers of students will have no access to roles which establish them as legitimate, meaningful persons. They will hang around, float or drift, as a consequence of the fact that they are *institutionally adrift*. Where is a sixteen-year-old male to go when he has dropped out of school, when the economy provides no work opportunity to the teenager? The issue in these situations is not whether a sense of belonging is fostered by the school, but whether the school as currently constituted has any prospect of becoming a significant enough experience for the youngster to offer some promise for positive identity. The problem is virtually that of creating new educational designs capable of capturing the loyalties of the young as a basic condition for their favorable socialization.

When we examine the problem of usefulness, we find young people are denied access to those experiences that contribute a sense of usefulness among adults. Most perform no vital function (other than growing up), they make no important decisions, they carry out no essential or valued tasks. The adolescent is not likely to sell cars (or anything else), teach, fix broken plumbing, sit on the city council, haul garbage, or any other tasks. There are very few opportunities indeed for young people to contribute anything which is seen as essential to the community in which they live. They are, in this sense, for the present, useless and irrelevant.

This irrelevance is no small part of the discontent that has led to adolescents' demands for "relevance."

The sense of competence, as is true with belongingness, is sharply limited by the insularity of the school experience. While a number of types of skills are possible (academic, athletic, social, musical, or others can provide a base of competence), nearly all derive their meaning as some type of *student* status. Student competencies are likely to have little or no meaning outside the school context, and to make little or no contribution to the well-being of the wider community. One can be the "best" student debator and still not feel to the slightest degree "relevant" or useful because such a competency has meaning only within the context of the school.

In the context of the inner-city, this problem of competence becomes especially acute. With the massive rejection of the school as an institution, adolescents are cut off from even the limited conventional youthful competencies. The development of competence then is free to flow along *unconventional* lines This can become especially critical when the young person withdraws from school, as Fleisher suggests in his analysis of the relationships between unemployment and delinquency:

> While crime prone youngsters are still in school, at least some of their time is legitimately occupied. But after they are allowed to drop out, time hangs heavily on their hands. If they are not able

to find jobs, their needs for the things that money buys are not readily satisfied legitimately. Therefore, they tend to resort to crime.[19]

More, such common resort to crime is frequently in fact responsive to a very real *illegitimate opportunity structure* in ghetto areas, capable of providing for the status needs of energetic and ambitious youngsters. In turn, recruitment to illicit activity serves to sustain the illegitimate opportunity structure as a permanently available solution to the absence of desirable alternatives.

III. THE ADOLESCENT AND PROMISES OF ADULTHOOD

Adolescent life today is characterized by sharp constraints on such important requirements as belongingness, usefulness, and personal power. Yet, despite the high levels of delinquency, and despite occasional outbreaks of unrest, most of the existence of most adolescents is relatively conventional. Given the potential of alienation that has been described, what factors produce such conformity?

While many factors are operating to reduce youthful dissidence and conflict, one distinctive feature of the adolescent experience is that it is a *transitional* state, oriented toward the promises of adulthood. Conventional students are likely to see learning in school, for example, not as an end in and of itself, but as a necessity in order to earn the grade to earn the credits to complete the diploma, to get the bachelor's degree, to enter graduate or professional school, or to find a decent job as an adult. Using such logic, the adolescent is likely to make sense of his present world not solely on the basis of immediate rewards, but on what he assumes will happen to him *in the future.*

This promised future can be used, then, as a way of dealing with problems of the present. A little boredom here, or a dull teacher there can be shrugged off, since after all, what really counts is what happens "later." This is, of course, part of what many analysts of adolescent behavior have labeled "deferred gratification," to which we should add a slight demurrer.

Those who are most successful in their school careers are those for whom the future looks very good indeed. To be sure, they are willing to make "sacrifices" (i.e., to defer other gratifications) in order to achieve that promised future. What should not be overlooked is that their immediate social experience is likely *as a consequence of both their present and anticipated success* to be very comfortable and satisfying.

A. ADOLESCENT SUCCESS AND DELINQUENCY CONSTRAINT

What bearing does this have on delinquency? What seems important here is how the institutions of the community, and the school in particular, by extending to some young persons access to rewarding and gratifying, if adolescent, roles, build up insulating barriers against deviance.

For one thing, such young people may have much to lose by "getting into trouble." A "record" may jeopardize entry into such fields as medicine, law or education. Also important are the implications of trouble as it might provide grounds for a reassessment of social reputation seen through the eyes of parents, neighbors, peers, and teachers.

But the constraints go beyond these essentially negative forces. For the successful youngster, a number of comfortable social settings and activities are available which provide "fun" relatively (but not completely) free from trouble. Athletics, dances, clubs, band or orchestra, student government, journalism, and debate are events with considerable amounts of adult supervision which serve to minimize the likelihood of troublesome behavior. Serving in addition to reinforce and make socially visible the adolescent's claim to "success" status, these activities operate as a social constraint against disapproved behavior by enmeshing the young person in socially approved settings.

B. THE PROBLEM OF DELINQUENCY: THE DENIAL OF SUCCESS

What of those who do not succeed? Those adolescents for whom no rewarding promise exists are placed in a bind. If the adolescent experience is to be understood in terms of its promise value, and if no valued promise can be made, there exist the conditions for strain. If the "good" students study, not primarily (or perhaps even at all) out of interest but because they "need the grade" in order to maintain their position in the flow of successful students, what comparable rationale exists for the student doing poorly?

Why should he study? Certainly, school attendance law requires attendance. Certainly, arguments can be advanced about the need for a high school diploma. Yet, such a student is in a position of a runner being told to run a race when he is also told that no matter what happens he cannot win.

Note, too, other complications. The identity one holds through academic competence spills over into other arenas, notably in the social relations of the school. Just as those who do well become the social "stars" of the school, so the unsuccessful become the pariahs. School regulations, as well as peer definitions, will result in a low participation in the social activities of the school. The unsuccessful are less likely to participate in journalism, music, student government, or even athletics.

Furthermore, they will be grouped together in "tracks" which set apart the "dummies" (non-college prep) from the socially acceptable (college-prep) groups. In a recent study, a high school girl remarked that she was always ashamed to carry her basic books face up for fear other students would see them and look down on her. The tactic clearly is not successful in concealing status difference. As one student observed:

> It really don't have to be the tests, but after the tests, there shouldn't be no separation in the classes. Because, as I say again, I felt good when I was with my class, but when they went and separated us—that changed us. That changed our ideas, our thinking, the way we thought about each other and turned us to enemies toward each other—because they said I was dumb and they were smart.[20]

What is especially catastrophic is the resultant deterioration of the students' estimates of their own worth and potential.

How is it that delinquency can come from this? In the words of one adolescent:

> You can't get on this, you can't get on that and the girls that were in my class back in the sixth grade—they look at you—"you're in the basic section aren't you." You know, all of a sudden the guys you used to hang out with won't hang out with you no more. They hang out with a new class of people. Like they're classifying themselves as middle class and you're low brow and, you know, you start feeling bad and I said I can prove that I'm middle class and I don't have to go to school to prove it.
>
> And so I did. I got out of school. All those kid's mothers buying them nice things in ninth and tenth grades. I said, baby, you ain't talking about nothing—and what your mother has to buy you I can get everyday. I used to sport around. Yeah—I used to show them $125—*every* day. I used to say—you have to go to school for 12 years and I only went for 9. (How did you get this money?) I'd take it. (How did you take it?) I broke into things. I used to have a little racket set up. I used to have a protection fee—anybody who wants to comes the street, anybody who wants to come into my territory, they has to pay me 25 cents. I gave boys certain areas where they couldnt' cross. A cat used to live up there. I say, "okay that's your deadline right there. If you want to go through this way, you give me 25 cents. If I ever catch you coming down through this way, you got a fight on your hands." And they gave me 25 cents.[22]

In the inner city, these processes take on even more dramatic proportions. Rates of withdrawal are high, and a much greater number of students will be assigned to non-college tracks. The results, both economic and psychological, are catastrophic. In a credentiated society, denial of access to education is a certificate for unemployment. The routes or avenues of entry to successful, conventional occupation become blocked, thus raising questions about the merits of conventionality itself.

The adolescent in the slum, ghetto, or *barrio,* then, is confronted with a school, and then community, environment that makes few promises of legitimate success. Inevitably some will turn to other and less conventional routes to valued goals. As an unfortunate aspect of this process, however, the school and related institutions will come to be seen as discredited agencies, defeating their occasional efforts to open up new career access mechanisms.

C. FAILURE AND DELINQUENCY

What case can be made for connecting school failure with delinquency? First, there is the evidence. Available research suggests that levels of misconduct are strongly related to where the person stands in school, the rates being highest among those students with poor grades in the

"basic" (or non-college) track, and lowest among those with high grades and in the college preparatory programs.[23]

Why should delinquency be high among the academically unsuccessful? A number of factors are at work. First, turning some of the earlier arguments around, the individual who is doing poorly, and who therefore has no valued promised future to threaten, does not experience the rational constraint against delinquency, i.e., he has less to lose by his misbehavior.

Second, if poor performance has pushed the adolescent psychologically and physically out of the school, then there is less likelihood that there will be adult monitoring or supervision of social activities. To be sure, this lack of supervision does not guarantee delinquency. (Nor does the presence of adults assure the absence of trouble.)

The point is that when young people are cut off from the school, they are simultaneously cut off from most of the adult institutions of the community. Such service groups as the YM-YWCA and Boy Scouts approach adolescents *via* the school. As a consequence, the tradition of such groups is to involve the "good" or "straight" students. What then happens to the unsuccessful youngster, who is cast out from the school and consequently cut off from adult contacts, is that he is likely to turn to the one place where he will find acceptance—a peer grouping of other unsuccessful adolescents.

Third, delinquency and rebellion become a way of striking back. As has been noted in a comparable process among prison inmates, what such behavior represents is a way of "rejecting the rejectors."

D. INSTITUTIONAL COMPONENTS OF FAILURE

Note, now, how the institutional practices contribute to the problem. The school creates a system of evaluation and rewards by which in the early years "bright" students are identified, to be funneled later into "college-prep" programs, thence on to college and the consequent (assumed) rewards. There is a hitch. The category "bright" requires the presence of another group—"dull," the status of "college-prep" can have meaning only if another group, the "non-college," exists.

There are at least four problematic aspects of this process. One, even granting the assumptions which underlie these sorting mechanisms, they appear to generate discontent and rebellion among those sorted at the bottom.

Two, considerable question has been raised about the validity of the concept "intelligence" and of our techniques for measuring it. The issue is not whether or not people differ in the degree to which they possess abilities, since obviously that is part of what creates the tremendous variation in human existence. What is at issue is specifically what intelligence is about, and the validity and reliability (and consequent policy questions) of available measurement devices, *especially as the concept*

is used to assign adolescent status and thus establish with a high degree of probability what the young person's future status is to be.

Three, the process calls for an *institutional grouping* of students, a collecting together of those with similar "abilities," and thus with similar future statuses. This segregation institutionalizes the stigma that attaches to those cast into low statuses, creating an immediate problem of visibility and humiliation, and a future problem as a result of the limited qualifications he will possess when he leaves the school.

Four, in inner-city schools, this grouping of students into a stigmatized, low status encompasses for all intents and purposes the entire school. When most students in a school are viewed by the school as being of limited academic potential, the character of the school itself becomes stamped with a negative label. In short, it becomes a problem school. Such schools are likely to receive lower financial support, to be staffed by inexperienced or less competent teachers, and are likely to be predominantly made up of minority groups. Such schools and the assumptions about student abilities then show through their institutional practices, become an integral, if unintended, device which segregates the poor and restricts their children's access to legitimate identities.

Such schools are not likely to be seen by students as creditable places, places where adolescents can build up a strong stake in conformity. Quite the opposite, these schools are likely to "turn off" students, resulting in their drift into the streets and whatever alternative avenues for success, however illegitimate, are available once they perceive the door to legitimacy as closed.

E. THE ORGANIZATIONAL BUILDING-UP OF STIGMATIZING LABELS

There is a further complication, one which brings us to the juvenile justice-correctional system. Our institutions have come to serve as an analogue to radar, identifying potential or real deviants, "locking-on" to them, and then progressively intensifying the process of negative labeling, especially (but not only) in the justice-corrections process. Thus, over the years records are accumulated and "files" built up. In many cases, these records pile up well before contact is made with police or court. School records especially, but also those of mental health, welfare, and other service agencies are likely to have accumulated for "difficult" youngsters.

The point is that *even before* the young person encounters the court, there is likely to have been created grounds for questioning his claims to legitimate status. Once such questions have been raised, there is a heightened likelihood that in his exposure to the justice-corrections system, a label denoting *official illegitimacy* will be applied.

What we encounter here is the possibility of what Lemert terms "secondary deviance," whereby the "helping" process actually becomes part of the problem, using as an illustration the case of the juvenile court:

> One of the great paradoxes of organized society is that agencies of social control may exacerbate or perpetuate the very problems they seek to ameliorate. In so doing they foster conditions of secondary deviance. Such deviance evolves out of adaptations and attempted adaptations to the problems created by official reactions to original deviance. From this point of view the sanctions, dispositions, or "treatment" imposed by the juvenile court personnel too often simply add another series of problems to original problems of parents and children, then further stigmatize the failures to cope with the new problems. The specifics of this process lie in the reactions made to special status which sets wards apart and special conduct standards which hold them accountable in ways not expected of other children. Probation exemplifies this process, wherein a youth is forbidden to associate with persons he regards as his friends, a girl is barred from seeing her boy friend, or a child is ordered not to see an "unfit" parent.[25]

Expanding on Lemert's ideas, there are two major problems that contribute to secondary deviation. First, the process itself frequently creates a new and additional set of rules which apply only to those in the deviant category, but which serve principally to expand the grounds whereby his behavior may be termed deviant:

> A teenager placed in a foster home is expected to obey orders of people who are strangers; the boy placed in a ranch school must tread a narrow path hedged with rules, many of which are drawn up with his potential deviance in mind. A youth may violate rules with perfectly good motives—to show loyalty to friends, to visit with a parent, or to look for employment. In other cases a boy may take leave from a ranch school because of problems beyond his power to solve. Yet the court typically defines such actions as "failures" or disobedience of its orders, which become legal justification for more severe measures whose effect is to move a minor farther along the road to correctional school.[26]

Second, each escalation of the record may add further stigma, entangling the deviant and the persons surrounding him in a web of rigidity and self-fulfilling prophecy which may become increasingly difficult to escape.

F. THE CONCERN FOR DIVERSION

It is in the court and correctional setting that there has been the greatest recognition of the negative consequences of this labeling process, and the resultant search for diversion mechanisms. Three factors have contributed to the move toward diversion. First, there is the disappointing lack of success of existing correctional practices. Recidivism is high in traditional institutional programs, and even where experiments have been tried in institutional settings, the results have been disappointing.[27]

Second, evolving out of concern about what Lemert terms secondary deviance, there is a growing awareness that the stigma of the court for correctional experience may very well be counterproductive for correction. If the treatment serves to aggravate rather than correct, the wisdom of its use must be questioned.

Third, there is growing awareness that the factors which forge legitimate identities lie *outside* the correctional system. It is the community arenas in experience such as found in school, work, politics, and family life that one builds a commitment to conformity. If correctional activities are to be designed to contribute to the development of legitimate identity, access must be gained, and programs developed, in such institutional arenas. Historically, of course, correctional programs have done just the opposite, physically segregating the offender and through legal sanctions and stigma, imposing significant social barriers to re-entry into community life (as seen, for illustration, in the difficulties of finding a job for the ex-convict, or in re-enrolling in school after release from the juvenile correctional facilities).

What can be differentiated, then, are two kinds of institutions: those which control access to *legitimate* identities (schools, work, politics), and those which control access to *illegitimate* identities (police, courts, welfare). The two are not the same. While they do interlock, they will have different bureaucratic logics. Creation of a legitimate person requires addressing what it is that schools, work, politics, or families do to establish legitimacy. Illegitimacy is what comes out of the "official" processes of the police, courts, and related institutions.

Most "diversion" programs initiated within the justice-correction system are premised on the notion that *not* processing the individual into an illegitimate identity (arrest, court referral, institutional disposition) avoids stigma and contributes to a correcting experience.

The problem is that by the time the person reaches the justice-correctional system, many of the features of an illegitimate identity may have already been established. Overlapping records from schools, welfare, mental health, and other service agencies may give eloquent testimony to the person's "toughness."

When this has happened, the problem for the correctional system is that its effort to avoid a hardening of the person's illegitimate role does not automatically mean that it has thereby provided him with access to legitimacy. Quite the opposite, in fact. If the individual has been fixed by school, work, welfare, and other institutional experiences into a marginal identity, the institutional pressures toward illegitimacy remain.

Not doing something negative does not in this instance mean that something positive will result. The positive part of the equation will follow only when at the same time there is movement away from illegitimacy, and experiences are provided that build up a legitimate identity and thus provide a new stake in conformity.

For the diversion program, what this means is that steps must be taken to alter procedures relating to illegitimacy which fall *within* the domain of justice and correctional agencies. At the same time, ways must be found to modify institutional practices in the educational, work, and political arenas that lie well outside the more limited justice-correctional system. Diversion programs, in other words, should link up with those program arenas that can provide the experience with competence, belongingness, usefulness and power that are features of legitimate identity.

IV. SOME PRINCIPLES FOR CREATION OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS

What is to be done? The foregoing, which provides a description of some of the problematic features of the institutional experiences of adolescence, still leaves open the question of alternative youth development strategies. The discussion which follows will be organized to suggest, first, some elements of a strategy for youth development efforts, and, second, some illustrations or examples of how these ideas can be, or have been, implemented.

A. COMPONENTS OF A STRATEGY OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT THROUGH DIVERSION

1. Avoidance of Official Labeling: The Problem of Coercion

A first question to ask of a development strategy is the extent to which it provides for diversion from the existing coercive justice-corrections system. The rationale for diversion lies in the growing awareness that public labels create a visible illegitimate identity which raises formidable barriers to movement into a legitimate role. Also, it is increasingly apparent that the coercion inherent in justice and correctional systems (the threat of prison is omnipresent) is corruptive of any therapeutic attempts to reshape the individual's existence. The client is forced to "play the game," to manipulate the therapy or rehabilitative setting because his survival is at stake.

Diversion, then, becomes one of the major tasks to be undertaken in development of a more effective juvenile justice system. To what extent are procedures created whereby young people can be dealt with outside the present court or correctional system? This, at first glance, might appear an easy matter, to be dealt with simply by providing service outside existing court or institution arrangements. There are, however, factors which can complicate the matter. If the diversion process is instituted by agents of the existing court or correctional process, it may be that in fact no real diversion has occurred. This becomes visible quickly when "trouble" occurs after the diversion. If the agents of the diversion program impose the same sanctions for trouble as would persons in the court or correctional setting, the program remains diversionary in name only.

2. Stigma Avoidance: The "Spoiled Image" Problem

It is rare that an individual is caught up in the court process without earlier indication of trouble The troublesome cases are likely to have long records in school adjustment or police files, the records being accompanied by open and public identification of the individual as "trouble." This identity can, and most often does, follow the person into any program. If a program is organized so that it publicly brings together only "troublesome" adolescents, no matter what its intent, the public biographies of these adolescents can lead to an aggravation of the stigma problem. To use an illustration of a common program, a "special adjustment" class in a high school, regardless of whatever "good" work it may attempt, must contend with what it means to the adolescent to be in that setting. *As a consequence of the program itself*, he becomes seen in public view as, in fact, a "troublemaker"—a process which can set off waves of reaction among peers, teachers, and the adolescent himself. An unwanted possibility, of course, is that the stigma of the program creates an intensification of the rejection process, an increase in feelings of mutual hostility and of apartness, and then rebellion.

There is a quick way of checking to see if a program is avoiding this "spoiled image" problem: examine the biographies of the youth involved. If the program is concerned only with "bad" adolescents (which generally means the young person *had* to do something "wrong" to come to the attention of the program), the program is of the "spoiled image" variety. It will take only a short period of time for the youth, and others, to recognize that the program is only for those with problems.

There is only one way to avoid stigma: involve a mix of young people (both "good" and "bad") in some form of legitimate, constructive activity. Stigma avoidance can occur only when the program develops procedures which permit persons to escape their earlier biography. Thus, the "badness" (or "goodness") of his previous identity *cannot be established* by his presence in the present activity.

3. Active Involvement of Youth: The Powerlessness-Passivity Problem

The two previous components, diversion and stigma avoidance, are essentially negative. They state what should *not* be done, but do not indicate what it is that should be done. One element of a positive strategy starts from the apparently straightforward assumptions that: (a) young people have skills, knowledge, abilities, and resources to contribute something to the communities in which they live, and (b) they should be given the opportunities to demonstrate this through their actions.

The difficulty comes in part because there are strong constraints in our society which impose a passive role on the young (children should be seen, not heard) and which are reflected in our institutional practices (youth are "taught" or lectured, programs provided, the court in their interest decides). Furthermore, the active participation must be reflected

in decision-making activity, forcing to at least some degree what the political scientists call a zero-sum game, i.e., the gains of adolescent power result by definition in the loss of power of adults to impose decisions. What is hoped for is that the gains in development of responsibility and cohesion offset the potential tension which results when persons and institutions must yield power.

4. Access to Legitimacy: The "Success" Problem

There is perhaps no issue more difficult to deal with, theoretically, than the problem of providing new routes of access to legitimate identities not only for adolescents generally, but especially for those seen as "troublesome." It can be hard, indeed, to argue that young people who have come to be seen as possessing low intelligence, limited ability, and are furthermore "difficult," have something positive to offer and can handle legitimate roles.

Yet, evidence that is accumulating demonstrates clearly that this is the case. To use a limited illustration, "slow" students have been shown not only to be effective in tutoring younger children, but also the students themselves change remarkably in the process.

Note what such an experience provides. First, it provides a new, and valued, way of establishing competence. Rather than being another abstract educational experience, the young person can actively engage in a process which can give him the sense that he can *do* something. Second, it builds a sense of contribution to the school, and by extension (with but a small amount of publicity) to the community. Not only can the student do something, but what it is comes to be seen by himself and others as meaningful; it contributes to the school. Third, it can develop a sense of belonging, both to the school, and when done properly, to the profession of teaching. For the troublesome youngster for whom the school has long been alien territory, the development of such a sense of belonging can possess dramatic implications.

We can now see some of the outlines of what conditions must be present to provide what we are calling *access to legitimacy*. First, such access starts from the assumption that young people, including the troublesome, have positive resources to contribute to the community. This assumption is quite different than the classical rehabilitation programs, which begin with the premise that the youth has a problem which must be identified and corrected.

Second, the program proceeds immediately to place the young person in an active role where something valuable is contributed, rather than in a passive role where some service is provided.

Third, it is located within a legitimate institution, the school, a crucial factor in the formation of legitimate identities.

Fourth, the tutoring experience can be organized quite easily so that a mix of "good" and "bad," "smart" and "dumb" students is possible.

Fifth, the activity constitutes diversion, both in the sense that it is not connected with the court process and in that legal coercion is not present, i.e., the program is purely voluntary.

In this illustration we can see, then, that creation of access to legitimacy ordinarily will depend on development of programs involving education and work, and probably both. It is the flow between education and adult job success that we are positing at the core of the idea of creating access to legitimate identity.

5. Community Involvement: The Problem of Bureaucratic Insulation

A further problem of significance to the justice and correctional systems is the insulation between such agencies that has resulted in the gradual building up of technically efficient, professional bureaucracies. Such institutions are too often far removed from the neighborhoods they are supposed to serve, and thus are vulnerable to being seen in the neighborhood context solely in their coercive or negative role. If policemen, for example, are seen and experienced only as persons who give traffic tickets, who tell young people to "move on," or who "bust" them, the presence of police can only mean trouble. Given this situation, it requires little intelligence to realize that the epithet "pig" may be a natural outgrowth of problematic experiences. It will be difficult to have fond feelings for an officer that in your experience has *only* brought pain.

The same situation holds true for the total correctional apparatus. Their bureaucratic segregation from local neighborhoods can only complicate the process of reintegration of offenders. Therefore, procedures need to be developed whereby local residents come to be involved in the correctional process, and thus come to build some commitment to the task of reducing and controlling youthful misconduct.

Past failure to develop procedures that involve local residents in the correctional process has had tragic consequences. Some of these have been painfully evident in costly prison rebellions, conducted mainly by inmates from the minority ethnic and racial groups. With little exception the inmates involved in these actions have been drawn from communities in which enforcement, judicial, and correctional work are seen as an activity of outsiders, of forces external to the life of the community. The perception of the criminal justice system as an alien force contributes significantly to the sense of political powerlessness rampant in minority group communities. This sense is unavoidably communicated to those members of the community who become involved in criminal offenses. It should hardly occasion surprise, therefore, if their response to the inadequacies of prison regimes is expressed in "political" terms.

The current "politicalization" of minority group prison inmates reflects a sense of injustice widely shared in disadvantaged communities.[28] The delinquent youth of these communities gain the impression early in their careers that the sanctioning judgments imposed on them are those

of an establishment dominated by the majority group rather than those of their own social world.

The reinforcement of this impression on repeated contacts with the law has two effects. First, it impairs the deterrent effectiveness of juvenile and criminal justice. Second, it provides a seemingly valid exculpatory justification for offense,[29] despite the fact that most arrests for juvenile offense are initiated by the complaints of residents of their own minority group communities.[30] It is thus evident that the themes of political oppression stressed by minority group inmates of prisons contain both spurious and valid elements, and each contributes enormously to the problems of both inmates and correctional personnel.

These problems can be remedied only by reducing the insulation of corrections and other justice agencies from the minority communities through mechanisms that involve local residents more directly in the activities of these agencies. This undertaking must form part of a wider effort at the reconstruction of these communities designed to create local institutions and organizations endowed with the power to deal directly with the entire range of problems faced by their populations.

6. "Outward" Orientation of Corrections: The Task of Advocacy

Following the above analysis of suggested aspects of a youth development strategy, we now turn to the equally relevant issue of the tactics necessary to achieve such programs. From the above, one implication is that corrections must orient its work much more externally. Specifically, developmental effort must be expanded in work and educational arenas to create new programs which provide access to legitimate identities for troublesome individuals.

Such a premise assumes that the correctional system cannot correct. What becomes important, then, is that *advocacy* become a basic ingredient of correctional strategy. This advocacy is of two types: individual and system. The concept of *individual advocacy* is well established. It is easy to accept the fact that part of a probation or parole officer's job is to negotiate for re-entry of the offender into the educational or work institutions on terms of equality with other incumbents.

System advocacy has been less well explored. The term is advanced to make explicit the need for the juvenile justice system to exert pressures on other community systems. To use a specific illustration, the process of creating a new curriculum inside a school requires a very different process than talking with an individual teacher about difficulties encountered by a probationer. It requires, for one, a theory or set of guiding ideas about education and educational process, such a theory perhaps being well removed from a correctional person's background and knowledge. Second, it demands that effective routes of access be developed, especially into those administrative levels that control curriculum licensing.

However complicated the problem of system advocacy might seem, it is an obvious necessity once an assumption is made that correction depends on access to legitimacy. An additional component here is the obvious fact that the clientele of the justice and corrections system form a weak constituency inside, say, the school. It goes without saying that troublemaking, disruptive students will not receive high priority in most educational planning. Unless the correctional personnel assume leadership, and engage in what we are calling system advocacy, it is likely that little will be done except to aggravate those educational malpractices which lock young persons into stigmatized and illegitimate identities.

7. Evaluation: Making the Case

To start a program to create new forms of legitimate identity, without some minimal commitment to evaluation and assessment, is tactical suicide. The more a program suggests radical alternatives to existing bureaucratic procedures (as in such assumptions that corrections cannot correct, or dumb kinds can learn), the more important it is to be able to establish careful evaluation so that when the program is over it is possible to state what has been learned. Without delving into the complexities of evaluation, what such assessment should yield is information relating to the questions: what was the program, and what were its effects? The evaluation should describe not only the effects, but identify the specific program components and procedures of which the effects are an outcome.

B. SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

How can the ideas from the above discussion be translated into action? There are a number of actual possibilities. Which set of activities should be undertaken will depend upon such factors as what kind of organization is responsible for initiating the action, what other agencies can be counted on to be cooperative, the power that the initiator has to move his and other institutions.

A critical factor will have to do with the distinction made earlier between agencies that are concerned with official illegitimacy (police, courts, correctional agencies, parole) *versus* those that are responsible for establishing legitimate identities (schools, work, politics). Key to implementing the strategy outlined here consists of linking up two sets of activities which require quite different approaches, namely: (1) the *diversion* of youth from the justice-correctional system (which requires the alteration of institutional policy somewhere in the nexus of police-court-institution-parole system), while simultaneously (2) developing educational or employment program alternatives which are basic to legitimacy as we have defined it. An essential feature to bear in mind here is that the part of the program which is about legitimacy must draw from a wider population than "troubled" individuals if it is to avoid stigmatizing those involved.

1. *The Youth Services Bureau.* One way of organizing programs consistent with the above guidelines might be to utilize the framework of the Youth Services Bureau. This type of agency was recommended in the Crime Commission Report produced in the late 1960's, which noted:

> There should be expanded use of community agencies for dealing with delinquents nonjudicially and close to where they live. Use of community agencies has several advantages. It avoids the stigma of being processed by an official agency regarded by the public as an arm of crime control. It substitutes for official agencies organizations better suited for redirecting conduct. The use of locally sponsored or operated organizations heightens the community's awareness of the need for recreational, employment, tutoring, and other youth development services. Involvement of local residents brings greater appreciation of the complexity of delinquents' problems, thereby engendering the sense of public responsibility that financial support of programs requires.[31]

The Commission then recommended that:

> An essential objective in a community's delinquency control and prevention plan should therefore be the establishment of a neighborhood youth-serving agency, a Youth Services Bureau, with a broad range of services and certain mandatory functions. Such an agency ideally would be located in a comprehensive community center and would serve both delinquent and nondelinquent youths. While some referrals to the Youth Services Bureau would normally originate with parents, schools, and other sources, the bulk of the referrals could be expected to come from the police and the juvenile court intake staff, and police and court referrals should have special status in that the Youth Services Bureau would be required to accept them all.[32]

Some caution should be introduced at this point concerning the Youth Services Bureau concept. While the idea grows directly out of the idea of diversion and is thus at least partially consistent with the strategy guidelines developed above, most of the Youth Services Bureau programs that have evolved to date have been concerned fundamentally with providing one or another form of clinical or counseling service to young persons "in trouble." That is to say, they have not placed a heavy emphasis on the development of programs of work or education which provide access to success experiences which build up a sense of legitimacy.

The Youth Services Bureau could serve as a model agency for linking up activities of these two kinds of agencies. It can provide the framework wherein diversion is achieved. It can provide both the institutional locus and the resources to bring about new programs in schools or in the work world. Perhaps a better way of expressing the idea is seeing the Youth Services Bureau as a *wedge* which permits the correctional

institutions to move program activities into the school–work areas of action. Properly conceived, in other words, this agency would occupy a position somewhere between these two kinds of agencies, functioning with a mandate to intervene in both.

Concretely, what a Youth Services Bureau in a given community might do is to negotiate with school and work agencies to create program components such as:

1) *"Self-study" groups* in the schools, whereby students and faculty come together to analyze and then deal with problems that are of concern to students, such as drug use, racial conflict, police-youth relations.

2) *Special work projects* which would give young persons an opportunity to demonstrate their potential to contribute valued services to the community. Examples would be: (a) *youth-tutor-youth programs,* where young persons of all ability levels would have a chance to help younger children learn, (b) *drug education programs,* where adolescents take responsibility for educating both students *and adults* (parents, teachers) about the youthful drug use scene, or (c) *crisis centers,* where young persons are made available to deal with a range of crises faced by youth, including rumor control, drug problems, and other emergencies faced by youth.

3) *Youth oriented "new careers" programs,* devoted to expanding the potential of the new careers concepts so that they are applied to youth, thus gaining access for youth to both jobs and alternative forms of educational experiences.

4) *Youth involvement programs,* whereby the Youth Services Bureau negotiates with a range of institutions and agencies (schools, school boards, county commissions, city councils, private agencies) to provide for participation of young people in decisions of these agencies, especially in areas of public policy.

5) *Community involvement programs,* where the Bureau negotiates mechanisms at the neighborhood level for participation of adults in correctional and other agency functioning.

In these five specific instances the concept of legitimate identity is functioning; it is in these areas that positive options are being forged. The Youth Services Bureau in the ordinary case must be organized to handle some correctional tasks as well. Thus, it can become an agency to which referrals can be made from official agencies (police, courts, or institutions), thus accomplishing the task of diversion. If the Bureau has developed the above position option types of programs, it can then in turn refer the adolescent on to such activities as a tutoring or a drug education program. The Youth Services Bureau then would serve in the capacity of *individual* advocate for the adolescent, raising the young person over the humps of experience that are to be anticipated in any case

where young persons are introduced into adult oriented and administered agencies. It is in this context that much of the services of traditional counseling programs can be provided.

This conception of the Youth Services Bureau sees the agency functioning on a "bridge" between the correctional agencies on the one hand, and the "legitimacy" agencies (school, work, politics) on the other. In this view it becomes the vehicle of system advocacy, whereby the interests of the correctional system have some chance to influence educational or employment systems such that the correctional clientele gain access to success experiences.

Other Implementing Procedures. The strategic ideas outlined here are in no way limited to or fixed by the Youth Services Bureau concept. There are a number of other possible ways of playing out the strategy in other contexts. Persons who are based in schools, for example, can on their own develop self-study groups and a variety of adolescent work-projects (such as tutoring), negotiating at the same time with juvenile court staff or police to provide some placements in programs for youth in trouble.

Persons located in a juvenile court setting can negotiate directly with supportive teachers or principals to evolve tutoring, drug education, or self-study programs in schools wherein some placement is reserved for youth referred by the court. Persons working in institutions may face difficulties simply from geographic isolation, but can carry out similar negotiations.

What runs through all these is the perspective implied by this strategy which, simply summarized, consists of the belief that *young people, even those in trouble, have something to offer,* and that the community will benefit by creating ways for adolescents to provide some service and thus develop feelings of belongingness, usefulness, and potency.

V. SUMMARY

The principles suggested in the foregoing analysis are offered as a set of guides in devising programs of youth development and delinquency prevention. They may be summarized:

1. *Delinquent behavior in the young has as its most general cause their exclusion from socially acceptable, responsible, and therefore personally gratifying roles.* While there may be wide variation in individual capacity to withstand the strain and frustration of such exclusion, failure to provide access to socially meaningful roles represents the fundamental condition underlying waywardness in the youth group.

2. *Roles are made available to the young by the institutions in which they participate.* Institution is here defined in the generic sense of established arrangements for conducting valued societal functions. Each such institution is constituted by a pattern of differentiated roles having a specifiable design. These designs may vary with respect to their capacity to allocate to their membership roles eliciting strong identification with the goals and values of the institution.

3. *With respect to the problem of delinquency, the critical matter in institutional role allocation is the acquisition of roles imparting to the individual a legitimate identity.* The latter type of role has the effect of creating in the person a firm attachment to the aims, values, and norms (rules and regulations) of the institutions, and of sharply reducing the probability of his involvement in delinquent activity.

4. *Since roles are a product of institutional design and procedure, and since obstruction to a favorable course of youth development arises from failure to provide roles creating legitimate identity, a rational strategy of delinquency reduction and control must address the task of institutional change.* It is clearly implied that the changes sought should be those capable of expanding the range of roles generating legitimate identity in young persons.

5. *Among the institutions significant in the lives of young persons during the period of maximum vulnerability to delinquency and/or withdrawal, the school is of central importance.* Delinquency is distinctively a problem of the adolescent period. Deficits in socialization attributable to faulty family experience may produce any of a wide variety of personal or social problems. Whether these deficits result in delinquent behavior depends on the course of adolescent experience. As the school, specifically the secondary school, is the "institutional home" of the adolescent in the structure of modern society, it constitutes the primary locus

of adolescent experience. Consequently, in its focus on institutional change, the proposed strategy specifies the educational institution as its primary target.

6. *The process through which illegitimate identities are formed and a commitment to delinquent activity arises among adolescents is best understood by contrast with the formation and maintenance of legitimate identity by adults.* Rates of crime for adults are substantially lower than those for adolescents. Adult status is characterized by opportunity for relatively meaningful participation in the economic and political activities of society. Utilization of such opportunity imparts a sense of competence and power and reduces alienation from the values and norms of basic societal institutions. Cut off from opportunity for similar participation by radical confinement to the milieu of the school, adolescents are significantly less likely to develop feelings of competence, of power, of usefulness. The presence of these elements of experience fosters the formation of legitimate identity; their absence creates alienation and fosters the formation of illegitimate identity.

7. *The tie of the young person to the school as his "institutional home" is maintained and reinforced by (a) the direct rewards of approval for valued academic and social performance; and (b) by the indirect rewards of a credible promise of a desirable occupational future.* Those adolescents whose interests, capacities, and talents are not engaged by the standard curriculum format are denied the rewards of current approval and of future promise, are thereby placed into a situation of drift with respect to the values and norms of the school, undergo loss of a sense of their legitimacy as persons, and become vulnerable to deviant and delinquent conduct expressive of discontent and rebellion.

8. *Young persons whose controlling ties to the school have been weakened, who thereby acquire a history of misbehavior, becoming subject to the repeated intervention of the juvenile justice system, are rendered increasingly vulnerable to delinquency through a process of building up of stigmatizing labels.* Repeated exposure to official treatment with its imposition of restrictions on normal activity tends to promote the development of an illegitimate identity, which in turn forms the basis for repeated infraction. The resulting escalation of stigma entangles the person in a web of self-fulfilling prophecy which becomes increasingly difficult to escape.

9. *To cope with this problem it is necessary to develop mechanisms to divert troublesome youth from the juvenile justice system.* To be effective, these mechanisms should be designed to increase youth participation in activities that forge legitimate identities by (a) avoiding their segregation into groups made up solely of stigmatized and troubled individuals, and (b) enlarging their opportunities, as members of "mixed"

groups, for involvement in school, work, community projects, political activity, and family life. Such activities, lying outside the correctional system, build a commitment to conformity.

10. *An important secondary target of institutional change is the juvenile corrections system itself, whose bureaucratic insulation from the communities of its clients impairs its effectiveness.* Because of their insulation, agents of juvenile justice are perceived as an alien, external, and hostile force without legitimating support from community leaders and other sources of local influence. The remedy lies in (a) creating a role for local community leadership in the administration of juvenile justice; and (b) inducing the agents of juvenile corrections to engage in "system advocacy," whereby they exert pressure on a variety of community institutions, perhaps notably the school system, to so alter their procedures as to enhance opportunities for their clients to develop a commitment to conformity.

FOOTNOTES

1. Edgar Z. Friedenberg, *Coming of Age in America*, Random House, New York, 1965.
2. For an excellent, succinct review of such efforts, see Don C. Gibbons, *Society, Crime, and Criminal Careers* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968, especially Chapter 20, "The Results of Treatment," pp: 515-530.
3. *National Strategy for Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention*, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1971 (mimeo).
4. The reference is to the growing body of theory and research in problems of bureaucracy now available in an extensive body of literature. The relevant aspects of this literature deal with such problems as goal displacement and limitations on the rational capacities of formal organizations. Recent experience reflecting limitations in the commitment of institutions to the goals of youth development and delinquency prevention is revealed in the publications and records of the New York City Mobilization for Youth, the Boston Roxbury Project, and earlier, the Chicago Area Project. See Walter B. Miller, "Inter-institutional Conflict and Delinquency Prevention," *Human Organization*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (Fall, 1958) pp. 20-33; Solomon Kobrin, "The Chicago Area Project—a 25 Year Assessment," *The Annals*, Vol. 322 (March, 1959) pp. 19–29; and Daniel Knapp and Kenneth Polk, *Scouting the War on Poverty*, D.C. Health, Lexington, Mass., 1971.
5. Erik H. Erickson, *Childhood and Society*, W. W. Norton Co., New York, 1950.
6. Jackson Toby, "Social Disorganization and Stake in Conformity," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 48 (May-June, 1957) pp. 12–17.
7. Walter C. Reckless, Simon Dinitz and Ellen Murray, "Self Concept as an Insulation Against Delinquency," *American Sociological Review*, 21 (December, 1956), pp. 744–746.
8. Friedenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
9. This discussion is derived in large part from Arthur Pearl, *the Atrocity of Education*, forthcoming. Although the words tend to be different, some of the same themes are discussed by Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," *American Sociological Review*, 24 (December, 1959) pp. 783–791.
10. Melvin Seeman, "Antidote to Alienation—Living to Belong," *Transaction*, 3 (May-June 1966) pp. 35–39.
11. *Ibid.*
12. While the norm of sponsored mobility into desirable status is distinctive for the British educational system, the corresponding American norm of contest mobility is decisively supplemented by informal modes of sponsorship. The withholding of such informal sponsorship from youth in the unfavored groups may be directly related to an exacerbation of their feelings of powerlessness. See Ralph Turner, "Sponsored and Contest Mobility in the School System," *American Sociological Review*, 25 (December, 1960), pp. 855–867.
13. Patricia C. Sexton, *Education and Income* (New York: the Viking Press, 1966); James S. Coleman *et al.*, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
14. For analysis of some resultant problems see the sections dealing with the juvenile court in: *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime*, Washington, D.C.: The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.
15. Friedenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
16. Friedenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
17. *Ibid*, p. 48.
18. Frank Musgrove, "The Problem of Youth and the Structure of Society in England," *Youth and Society*, 1 (September, 1969), pp. 38–58.
19. Belton M. Fleisher, *The Economics of Delinquency* Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1966, pp. 82–84.
20. Walter E. Schafer and Kenneth Polk, "Delinquency and the Schools," *Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime* Washington, D.C.: The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967, p. 241.

21. *Ibid*, pp. 241–242.
22. *Ibid*, p. 242.
23. Stinchcombe, Arthur L., *Rebellion in a High School*, Chicago, Quadrangle, 1964; Polk, Kenneth, "Class, Strain and Rebellion Among Adolescents," *Social Problems*, 17 (Fall 1969); Schafer, Walter E. and Carol Olexa, *Tracking and Opportunity, the Locking-Out Process and Beyond*, Chandler Publishing Co., 1971.
24. Arthur Pearl, "Youth in Lower Class Settings," in Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif, *Problems of Youth* Chicago: Aldine, 1965, pp. 89–109.
25. Edwin W. Lemert, *Instead of Court: Diversion in Juvenile Justice*, National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Crime and Delinquency, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971, p. 13.
26. *Ibid.*
27. See Gibbons, *Society, Crime and Criminal Careers, loc. cit.*
28. Herbert Jacob, *op. cit.*
29. Gresham M. Sykes and David Matza, "Techniques of Neutralization," 22, *American Sociological Review*, (Dec. 1957) pp. 664–670.
30. Donald J. Black and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., "Police Control of Juveniles," 35, *American Sociological Review*, (February 1970), pp. 63–77.
31. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, Report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1967, p. 83.
32. *Ibid.*

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1972 O—475-024